

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

WILLIAM D. HUBBARD,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 3:06-MC-0078-M
)	
HONORABLE A. JOE FISH,)	
Defendant.)	

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This cause of action was referred to the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b), as implemented by an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas. The Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge follow:

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS


On August 23, 2006, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to file an unspecified action. No process has issued in this case.

Court records indicate that Plaintiff has abused the federal judicial system. The Northern District of Texas has previously sanctioned Plaintiff for filing frivolous actions. *See Hubbard v. Chase Cardmember Services*, No. 3:06-MC-069-N (N.D. Tex. filed July 19, 2006). Pursuant to the sanctions order, Plaintiff is required to pay a \$1,000 sanction prior to filing any actions in this Court. Plaintiff has not paid this sanction. Plaintiff's motion for leave should therefore be denied.

RECOMMENDATION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court recommends that the District Court deny Plaintiff's motion as barred by sanctions.

Signed this 14th day of September, 2006.



PAUL D. STICKNEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR SERVICE AND
NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL/OBJECT**

The United States District Clerk shall serve a true copy of these findings, conclusions and recommendation on Plaintiff. Pursuant to Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1), any party who desires to object to these findings, conclusions and recommendation must serve and file written objections within ten days after being served with a copy. A party filing objections must specifically identify those findings, conclusions or recommendation to which objections are being made. The District Court need not consider frivolous, conclusory or general objections. A party's failure to file such written objections to these proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation shall bar that party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Additionally, any failure to file written objections to the proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation within ten days after being served with a copy shall bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the Magistrate Judge that are accepted by the District Court, except upon grounds of plain error. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).